The Fermi problem in disordered systems

G. Menezes*
Grupo de Física Teórica e Matemática Física, Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, 23897-000 Seropédica, RJ, Brazil

N. F. Svaiter†
Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, 22290-180 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

H. R. de Mello‡ and C. A. D. Zarro§
Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 21941-972 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

arXiv:1702.08310v1 [quant-ph] 27 Feb 2017

We revisit the Fermi two-atoms problem in the framework of disordered systems. In our model we consider a two-qubits system linearly coupled with a quantum massless scalar field. We assume that the coefficients of the Klein-Gordon equation are random functions of the spatial coordinates. The disordered medium is modeled by a centered, stationary and Gaussian process. We demonstrate that the classical notion of causality in special relativity is meaningless in the presence of random fluctuations of the light cone. Possible repercussions are discussed.

Introduction.—Causality is the most essential relationship underlying any natural process. The notion of causality in physics arises prominently in several circumstances. For relativistic quantum fields, microcausality is the spacelike local commutativity or anticommutativity of fields. A well known example concerning macrocausality is closely related to the Fermi model for propagation of light in quantum electrodynamics [1]. With such a model Fermi proposes the inspection of the radiative processes of two localized quantum systems interacting with a quantum field. These localized systems consist of two two-level atoms separated by some spatial distance r. In order to address the issue of causality within this context, Fermi discusses the following gedanken experiment. Consider that, at an arbitrary initial time τ_0, atom 1 is in the excited state, whereas atom 2 is in the ground state, and both are coupled with a quantum field prepared in the Minkowski vacuum state. Under certain approximations, Fermi argues that the probability for the atom 2 to be excited (with the field remaining in the vacuum state) remains zero until a time τ is reached such that $\tau - \tau_0 \geq d$. We remark that this simple model enables one to investigate causality at the microscopic level.

The Fermi's two-atoms system has been discussed in detail in many works [2–7]. Notwithstanding, the emergence of some questions regarding Fermi's calculation reveals that a more careful consideration of the model could be required. This is important in order to avoid an inaccurate description of the interplay between causal signaling and quantum non-local phenomena. The controvery is justified on the grounds that Fermi's conclusion could be incorrect due to an apparent artificial approximation carried out by him [8], among other issues [9]. The situation was soon clarified and it was realized that there were no causality problems within the Fermi set up, as long as a proper analysis is undertaken. See for instance Refs. [10–12]. For recent discussions and new trends concerning the Fermi problem, we refer the reader the Refs. [13–18].

On the other hand, since the concept of causality is intimately connected with the existence of light cones in the construction of the special relativity, it is not clear how to discuss causality in physical processes when the structure of the light cones is altered. This takes place whenever one allows for the presence of quantum fluctuations of the spacetime. Such quantum effects are expected to arise in any quantum theory of gravity. Hence a comprehensive and thorough account of quantum metric fluctuations would demand a full quantum theory of gravity. Nevertheless, it is still possible to discuss low-energy quantum gravitational effects within an effective-field-theory approach [19, 20]. On the other hand, one may resort to simplified models which would reproduce the quantum fluctuations of the light cone. One of these models was established by Ford and collaborators [21–27]. It was shown through such results that the fluctuations of the geometry of spacetime caused by a bath of squeezed gravitons generates light-cone smearing.

In this Letter we propose to investigate how the concept of causality is disturbed in the presence of light-cone fluctuations. We take the Fermi's two-atoms system described above as our basic archetype in order to discuss such a phenomenon. As a first step in this program we assume a stochastic ensemble of fluctuating geometries. In other words, we consider that light-cone fluctuations can be treated classically and the effects on the propagation of quantum fields can be described in the context of random differential equations [28, 29]. We remark that the propagation of acoustic excitations in random media can be envisaged as an analog model for quantum gravity effects [30–32]. Indeed, such an approach adequately describes the effects of the metric fluctuations in the propagation of signals associated with the quantum fields. For interesting discussions on analog models of

gravity, see Refs. [33–35]. In turn, within this scenario one may also depart from the inquiry for analog models of quantum gravity effects and conceive the Fermi problem in a more general context of disordered media. To simplify the calculations we assume the units to be such that $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$.

Photodetection and causality in quantum field theory.—Let us discuss the Fermi problem in a perturbative framework. Being more specific, we employ a time-dependent perturbation theory in order to evaluate the associated transition probabilities for a finite time interval $[\tau_0, \tau]$. For simplicity and without any loss of generality, we consider two identical static qubits interacting with a massless scalar field. Since the trajectories are stationary, the qubits have stationary states with well defined energy levels. We are working in four dimensional Minkowski spacetime. The total Hamiltonian of the system is given by

$$H = H_A + H_F + H_I, \tag{1}$$

where the Hamiltonian of the free atomic system is given by

$$H_A = \frac{\omega_0}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sigma_j^z, \tag{2}$$

where $\sigma_j^z = |e_j\rangle\langle e_j| - |g_j\rangle\langle g_j|$, $j = 1, 2$, $|g_1\rangle$ and $|g_2\rangle$ being the ground states of the atoms isolated from each other, with energies $-\omega_0/2$, and $|e_1\rangle$ and $|e_2\rangle$ their respective excited states, with energies $\omega_0/2$. The free Hamiltonian of the quantum scalar field is given by

$$H_F = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\, \omega_{\mathbf{k}}\, a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(t) a_{\mathbf{k}}(t), \tag{3}$$

where $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = |\mathbf{k}|$. The atom-field interaction Hamiltonian has two local contributions, namely:

$$H_I = \lambda\, m_1(\tau)\varphi[x_1(\tau)] + \lambda\, m_2(\tau)\varphi[x_2(\tau)], \tag{4}$$

where $m_j = (i/2)(\sigma_j^- - \sigma_j^+)$ is the monopole moment operator of the j-th atom, with $\sigma_j^- = |g_j\rangle\langle e_j|$ and $\sigma_j^+ = |e_j\rangle\langle g_j|$. We assume that $\lambda \ll 1$. Let us consider that the system was initially prepared in the state $|\phi_i\rangle = |e_1 g_2\rangle \otimes |0_M\rangle$, where $|0_M\rangle$ is the Minkowski vacuum state of the scalar field. By using time-dependent perturbation theory within the interaction picture, one obtains that the transition probability amplitude to the final atom-field state $|\phi_f\rangle = |g_1 e_2\rangle \otimes |0_M\rangle$ is given by (up to second order in λ)

$$\langle \phi_f | U(\tau, \tau_0) | \phi_i \rangle = \mathcal{A}_{\phi_i \to \phi_f} = -\mathcal{C}_{12} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} d\tau' \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} d\tau'' \times\, e^{-i\omega_0(\tau' - \tau'')}\, G_0(\tau' - \tau'', r) \tag{5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_{12} = \lambda^2 \langle g_1 | m_1(\tau_0) | e_1 \rangle \, \langle e_2 | m_2(\tau_0) | g_2 \rangle = \frac{\lambda^2}{4}, \tag{6}$$

and $G_0(x(\tau), x(\tau')) = \langle 0_M | T\big[\varphi(x(\tau))\varphi(x(\tau'))\big] | 0_M \rangle$ is the Feynman propagator of the free scalar field, $r = |\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2|$ being the spatial separation between the qubits and T is the Dyson time-ordering symbol. Introducing the variables $\xi = \tau' - \tau''$ and $\eta = \tau + \tau'$, expression (5) becomes

$$\mathcal{A}_{\phi_i \to \phi_f} = -\mathcal{C}_{12} \int_{-\Delta\tau}^{\Delta\tau} d\xi\, (\Delta\tau - |\xi|)\, e^{-i\omega_0 \xi}\, G_0(\xi, r), \tag{7}$$

where $\Delta\tau = \tau - \tau_0$. The Feynman propagator for the free scalar field is given by [36]

$$G_0(\xi, r) = \frac{i}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{\xi^2 - r^2} \right) - \frac{1}{8\pi r}\, \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \Big[\delta(r - \xi) - \delta(r + \xi) \Big]. \tag{8}$$

When one inserts this expression in Eq. (7), one gets two contributions. The contribution related with the above Dirac delta function will produce a Heaviside theta function $\theta(-r + \Delta\tau)$. This term is in accordance with the definition of causality given by the Geneve school [37]. On the other hand, the other contribution yields a finite term for $\Delta\tau > r$ *and also a finite term for* $\Delta\tau < r$. The latter is a function proportional to $1/(\omega_0 r)$ [in fact, one can show that it is a combination of the trigonometric integrals $\mathrm{Ci}(\omega_0 r), \mathrm{Si}(\omega_0 r)$ and trigonometric functions $\cos(\omega_0 r), \sin(\omega_0 r)$ times $1/(\omega_0 r)$]. As previously outlined, this outcome has been discussed in the literature in many papers: The dispute is on the causal behavior of the probability amplitude $\mathcal{A}_{\phi_i \to \phi_f}$. However, as argued by Pauli, Stueckelberg and others [37, 38], the concept of causality in relativistic quantum field theory has meaning only in the wave zone $\omega_0 r \gg 1$. Hence since the anomalous term mentioned above vanishes in the wave zone, causality as defined by the Geneve school is preserved.

Light-cone fluctuations and causality.—Following the aforementioned discussion, the purpose of this work is to discuss the notion of causality in disordered media in the framework of the well known Fermi's problem of two-qubits system. We assume that a possible approach to study the effects of disorder over matter fields is to assume that the equations of motion associated with the matter fields must be given by differential operators with random coefficients. In order to access the modification caused by the fluctuating light cone on transition probabilities, we implement a perturbation calculation similar to the one discussed in Refs. [30–32]. Let us consider the following random massless scalar Klein-Gordon equation

$$\left[\big(1 + \mu(\mathbf{r})\big) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \Delta \right] \varphi(t, \mathbf{r}) = 0, \tag{9}$$

where Δ is the three dimensional Laplacian. For $\mu(\mathbf{r})$ we will take a zero-mean Gaussian random function:

$$\langle \mu(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_{\mu} = 0, \tag{10}$$

with a correlation function given by

$$\langle \mu(\mathbf{r})\mu(\mathbf{r}')\rangle_\mu = \sigma^2\,\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'), \tag{11}$$

where σ^2 quantifies the intensity of random fluctuations. The symbol $\langle ... \rangle_\mu$ denotes an average over all possible realizations of this random variable. Observe that we assume a time-independent random function. Hence, the random Klein-Gordon equation of Eq. (9) can be solved within a perturbation expansion in the noise function. In this way, the Feynman propagator can be written as:

$$G(x,x') = G_0(x-x') + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int dz_1\, G_0(x-z_1)\mathcal{G}^{(n)}(z_1,x'), \tag{12}$$

where $G_0(x-x')$ is the Feynman propagator for the free field, Eq. (8), and

$$\mathcal{G}^{(n)}(z_1,x') = (-1)^n\prod_{j=1}^{n} L_1(z_j)\int dz_{j+1}\, G_0(z_j,z_{j+1}), \tag{13}$$

with $L_1(x)$ being the random differential operator:

$$L_1(x) = L_1(t,\mathbf{r}) = -\mu(\mathbf{r})\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}. \tag{14}$$

In Eq. (13), it is to be understood that $z_{n+1} = x'$ and that there is no integration in z_{n+1}. Details on the derivations of the above expressions can be found in Ref. [31].

After performing the averages over the noise function, the Feynman propagator associated with the massless scalar field can be written in the form of a Dyson equation:

$$\langle G\rangle_\mu = G_0 - G_0\Sigma\,\langle G\rangle_\mu, \tag{15}$$

with Σ being the self-energy. The one-loop contribution to Σ is obtained from noise averaging the second order contribution in the random function μ. By employing an usual Fourier analysis, one obtains integrals which can be evaluated considering contour-integration methods. The final result for the second-order contribution in μ for the Feynman propagator is given by

$$\langle \bar{G}_0^{(1)}(x,x')\rangle_\mu = \frac{6i\sigma^2}{(2\pi)^3}\left[\frac{\mathcal{F}(\Delta t,|\Delta\mathbf{x}|)\,\theta(\Delta t)}{[(\Delta t-i\epsilon)^2-|\Delta\mathbf{x}|^2]^5} + \frac{\mathcal{F}(-\Delta t,|\Delta\mathbf{x}|)\,\theta(-\Delta t)}{[(\Delta t+i\epsilon)^2-(\Delta\mathbf{x})^2]^5}\right], \tag{16}$$

where $\Delta t = t-t'$, $\Delta\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'$ and we have defined

$$\mathcal{F}(\Delta t,|\Delta\mathbf{x}|) = \Delta t\Big[5(\Delta t-i\epsilon)^4 + 10(\Delta t-i\epsilon)^2|\Delta\mathbf{x}|^2 + |\Delta\mathbf{x}|^4\Big] - 4(\Delta t-i\epsilon)\Big[(\Delta t-i\epsilon)^4 - |\Delta\mathbf{x}|^4\Big]. \tag{17}$$

By inserting this contribution in Eq. (7), one gets a finite term for $\Delta\tau < r$ which *does not vanish in the wave zone* $\omega_0 r \gg 1$. In fact, this term yields the finite contribution

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}^{(1)}_{\phi_i\to\phi_f}\Big|_{\omega_0 r\gg 1} \approx \frac{\mathcal{C}_{12}\,\omega_0^3}{12}\,\sin(\omega_0\Delta\tau),\ \ \Delta\tau < r. \tag{18}$$

So two distinct situations appear before us. One possible interpretation is that the arguments previously invoked on the definition of causality simply do not apply in the presence of light-cone fluctuations. This is due to the fact that the smearing of the light cone modifies virtual processes; since wave-zone effects are manifestations of real photons whereas near-field processes are a result of a collection of real and virtual photons effects, one should expect substantial changes in the picture raised above. One could even speculate that this situation is unveiling the following phenomenon: Virtual photons responsible for near-field fluctuations might originate effects with a range comparable with those of real photons in the presence of light-cone fluctuations. On the other hand, if one insists in maintaining causality as perceived by Pauli and Stueckelberg, from the above result one must resort to a time average of the probability amplitude. In this way, it is straightforward to see that the finite term for $\Delta\tau < r$ vanishes and causality is restored.

Conclusions.—There is a contentious discussion on the causal behavior regarding the radiative processes involving two identical qubits coupled with a quantum field. This is the Fermi's two-atom problem which has witnessed a vigorous revival in recent years. This simple model allows one to investigate measurement and observability of correlations through quantum detection processes. In this Letter we considered the same physical system immersed in a random medium. Being more specific, we have proposed to study the issue of the macrocausality for the case in which we allow for random fluctuations of the light cones. In the case of a Minkowski spacetime with fixed light cones, using the arguments developed by Pauli we recovered the usual result that states that the macrocausality is maintained, at least up to second-order in time-dependent perturbation theory. On the other hand, we studied quantum field in a disordered environment and we have found that the usual definition of macrocausality do not apply in the presence of light-cone fluctuations. We conjecture that this outcome can be extended to all orders in perturbation theory.

A natural question is whether the same results are attainable in a non-perturbative framework. Concerning disordered systems, the usual option is given by the replica-trick approach [39]. Within this technique one forms n statistically independent copies of the original system, obtaining a quenched free energy functional evaluable from a zero-component field theory. In turn, a recent mathematical rigorous method regarding the computation of the average free energy of a disordered sys-

tem was developed in Ref. [40]. The basic apparatus is a distributional zeta-function. Within this new formalism the comprehension of the features of the permutation group when the number of replicas goes to zero is not a mandatory requirement. Another interesting generalization is connected with a possible Anderson-localization mechanism comprised in our model. Anderson localization is usually defined as the vanishing of the diffusion coefficient [41]. On the other hand, an invaluable extension of our results is to ascertain the above conclusions for the case of quantum fluctuations of the light cone. It would be of particular interest to confront the conclusions and interpretations in both situations. An akin situation would be to consider the role of a spacetime foam in the radiative processes of the Fermi two-atoms problem [42]. It is known that restrictions on the measurability of spacetime distances seem to emerge quite naturally in a framework which properly takes into account both quantum mechanical and general-relativistic effects [43]. This is expected to modify our current understanding on the concept of causality within Fermi's set up. Such subjects are under investigation by the authors.

This paper was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq, Brazil).

* gabrielmenezes@ufrrj.br
† nfuxsvai@cbpf.br
‡ hrmello@if.ufrj.br
§ carlos.zarro@if.ufrj.br

[1] E. Fermi, Rev. Mod. Phys. **4**, 87 (1990).
[2] W. Heitler and S. T. Ma, Proc. R. Ir. Acad. **52**, 123 (1949).
[3] J. Hamilton, Proc. Phys. Soc. A **62**, 12 (1949).
[4] M. Fierz, Helv. Phys. Acta **23**, 731 (1950).
[5] B. Ferretti, in *Old and New Problems in Elementary Particles*, edited by G. Puppi (Academic Press, New York,1968), p. 108.
[6] P. W. Milonni and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **10**, 1096 (1974).
[7] A. K. Biswas, G. Compagno, G. M. Palma, R. Passante and F. Persico, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 4291 (1990); Phys. Rev. A **44**, 798 (1991).
[8] M.I. Shirokov, Yad. Fiz. **4**, 1077 (1966).
[9] G. C. Hegerfeldt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 596 (1994).
[10] D. Buchholz and J. Yngvason, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 613 (1994).
[11] P. W. Milonni, D. F. V. James and H. Fearn, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 1525 (1995).
[12] E. A. Power and T. Thirunamachandran, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3395 (1997).
[13] F. Buscemi and G. Compagno, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022117 (2009)
[14] E. Zohar and B. Reznik, N. Journ. Phys. **13**, 075016 (2011).
[15] C. Sabin, M. delRey, J. J. Garcia-Ripoll and J. Leon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 150402 (2011).
[16] M. del Rey, C. Sabín and J. Léon, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 045802 (2012).
[17] R. H. Jonsson, E. Martín-Martínez and A. Kempf, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 022330 (2014).
[18] S. Derouault and M. A. Bouchene, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 023828 (2014).
[19] John F. Donoghue, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2996 (1994), ibid, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3874 (1994).
[20] W. Dittrich and M. Reuter, *Effective Lagrangians in Quantum Electrodynamics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1986).
[21] L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1692 (1995).
[22] L. H. Ford and N. F. Svaiter, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 2226 (1997).
[23] L. H. Ford and N. F. Svaiter, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 2640 (1996).
[24] H. Yu and L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 084023 (1999).
[25] R. T. Thompson and L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 024014 (2008).
[26] R. T. Thompson and L. H. Ford, Class. Quant. Grav. **25**, 154006 (2008).
[27] H. Yu, N. F. Svaiter and L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 124019 (2009).
[28] A. Ishimaru, *Wave Propagation and Scattering in Random Media* (Academic, New York, 1978).
[29] J. Pierre Fouque, J. Garnier, G. Papanicolaou and K. Solna, *Wave Propagation and Time Reversal in Randomly Layered Media* (SpingerScience+Bussiness Media, LLC, 2007).
[30] G. Krein, G. Menezes and N. F. Svaiter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 131301 (2010).
[31] E. Arias, E. Goulart, G. Krein, G. Menezes and N. F. Svaiter, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 125022 (2011).
[32] G. Krein, G. Menezes, E. Arias and N. F. Svaiter, Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. A **27**, 1250129 (2012).
[33] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 1351 (1981).
[34] *Artificial Black Holes*, edited by M. Novello, M. Visser and G. Volovick (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
[35] *Quantum Analogues: From Phase Transition to Black-Hole Cosmology*, edited by R. Schutzhold and G. W. Unruh (Springer, Berlin, 2007).
[36] N. D. Birrell e P. C. W. Davis, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1982).
[37] E. C. G. Sueckelberg and D. Rivier, Helv. Phys. Acta **23**, 215 (1950).
[38] W. Pauli, *Pauli lectures on physics: Selected Topics in Field Quantization* (Dover Publications, New York, 1973).
[39] V. Dotsenko, *Introduction to the Replica Theory of Disordered Statistical Systems* (Cambrige University Press, Cambridge, 2001).
[40] B. F. Svaiter and N. F. Svaiter, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **31**, 1650144 (2016).
[41] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).
[42] L. J. Garay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2508, (1998); ibid. Phys. Rev. D **58**, 124015 (1998).
[43] G. Amelino-Camelia, Nature, **398**, 216 (1999); ibid. Mod.Phys. Lett. A **9**, 3415 (1994),